



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/734,883      | 12/13/2000  | Jeffrey A. Dean      | 0026-0006           | 5681             |

44989 7590 10/03/2005

HARRITY & SNYDER, LLP  
11240 WAPLES MILL ROAD  
SUITE 300  
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,883

Applicant(s)

DEAN ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

AT

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1) This is a Nonfinal rejection in response to the amendment and remarks filed on 4/05 with a Request for Reexamination.
- 2) Claims 1-34 are pending and rejected in this action. Applicant cancels claims 35, 36.
- 3) Effective provisional date is 12/15/1999.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

- 4) A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/26/05 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

- 5) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5-1) **Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13, 17, 18, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (US 6070158, filed Nov 1997), in view of NonPatent Literature "WebWatcher: A**

**Learning Apprentice for the World Wide Web” (Robert Armstrong, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, issued Feb 1, 1995, pages 1-7)(hereinafter “WebWatcher”).**

**Claim 1**, Kirsch teaches identifying ... more entries (ie., the search engine identifies a predetermined document from the collection of documents)(col 3, line 66- col 4, line 5); Determining ... document (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher’s advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page’s highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 2**, Kirsch teaches web document (ie., web document)(col 1, line 45).

**Claim 4**, Kirsch teaches intercepting ... client (ie., Fig 1, item 16 shows the search the search site input data from the server 18 and outputs to client.

**Claim 5**, Kirsch does not teach but Webwatcher teaches each of the entries ... to the link (ie., fig 4, shows the link "University of Illinois" to another page based on the desired result)(page 2, and page 3, top left column).

**Claim 6**, Kirsch does not teach but Webwatcher teaches each of the entries ... identified document (ie., fig 4, shows the link "University of Illinois" to another page based on the desired result)(page 2, and page 3, top left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link that refers to a further page as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 11**, Kirsch teaches receiving ... user (ie., user query)(col 3, line 57);

Determining ... received query (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42);

Associating ... identified document (ie., creating a list of unique document Ids and their corresponding relevancy scores)(col 13, lines 38-40).

**Claim 13**, Kirsch teaches receiving ... user (ie., user query)(col 3, line 57);

Determining ... received query (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42);

Associating ... identified document (ie., creating a list of unique document Ids and their corresponding relevancy scores)(col 13, lines 38-40).

Art Unit: 2176

**Claim 17**, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches “visually distinguishing the entries based on the determined scores” (ie., highlighting the link and adding bracketed eyes icon to the recommended link)(page 3, upper left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page’s highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 18**, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches visually distinguishing ... determined scores (ie., highlighting the link and adding bracketed eyes icon to the recommended link and highlighting the most promising links)(page 3, upper and lower left column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page’s highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 22**, Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches annotating the entries based on the scores (ie., highlighting the most promising links to the user and adding the eyes icon)(Fig 4, page 3, upper left corner).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page’s highlighted link with an icon

Art Unit: 2176

as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 24**, Kirsch teaches determining ... document (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches identifying a document based ... plurality of entries (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

modifying ... providing the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user.

Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 25**, Kirsch teaches a memory configured to store instructions (ie., memory on a computer)(col 7, line 4);

determining a score of each of the entries in the one or more documents (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches identify one or more documents that include a plurality of entries based on one or more addresses associated with the one or more documents (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

Modify the entries based on the determined score, provide the modified document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 26**, Kirsch teaches a browser (ie., web browser)(col 5, line 14);

a browser assistant configured to determine ... documents (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).



Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches request documents from ... plurality of entries (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

Modify the requested documents based on the determined scores and present the modified documents to facilitate selection of one or more of the entries (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 27**, is rejected under a similar line of rejection as claim 26 since the claimed subject matter is equivalent to claim 26.

**Claim 28**, is rejected under the similar line of rejection as claim 1 since the claimed subject matter is equivalent to claim 1.

**Claim 29**, Kirsch teaches identifying the entries in the document (ie., search engine to identify a predetermined document)(col 3, line 65-col 4, line 5);

Sending the identified entries to a server (ie., the search service reference the document by a document server which sends the result to the Internet, presumable thru the internet server)(col 5, lines 15-23);

Receiving, from the server, scores for the identified entries (ie., the requesting client receives the results with scores via the internet and displays to the user)(see Fig 1, items 14, 16, 18; col 5, lines 15-23).

**Claim 30**, Kirsch teaches sending the document to a server (ie., with a distribute database server within the search site, the document server 18 gets the document, adds the highlights or other identifiers and sends the result to the client)(col 7, lines 30-35; col 5, lines 15-23).

**Claim 31**, Kirsch teaches a memory configured to store instructions (ie., memory on a computer)(col 7, line 4);

determine a score for each of the entries in the one or more documents (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches obtaining a request for a document that includes one or more entries, identify the documents based on one or more addresses associated with the documents (ie., the highlighted link advises user to follow link to a further ML page)(page 3, upper left column; fig 4, 5);

Modify the document based on the determined score, provide the modified document ... document (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets

Art Unit: 2176

the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**Claim 33**, Kirsch teaches receiving a document [ ], the document including one or more entries (ie., the web search service allows content based search to be conducted against documents maintained at eh distributed search sites and in turn the sent to the document server)(col 5, lines 17-23).

Determining ... entries (ie., search scores of intersected documents to yield a relevancy score for each of the documents)(col 5, lines 38-42).

Kirsch does not teach, but Webwatcher teaches modifying ... sending the modified document to the second server (ie., webwatcher, upon identifying hyperlinks, highlighting the most promising link in order to suggest them to the user. Additionally, in Fig 4, the webwatcher brackets the highlighted link with eyes icon to indicate webwatcher's advice that the user follow the link)(page 3, left column, top and bottom paragraphs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include modifying the identified page's highlighted link with an icon as taught by Webwatcher, providing the benefit of helping users locate desired

information by employing learned knowledge about which hyperlinks are likely to lead to the target information (Webwatcher, pag 1, Abstract section).

**6-2) Claims 3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Pant et al (US 6012053, filed Jun 23, 1997).**

**Claim 3**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach but Pant teaches non-web document (col 1, lines 32-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include non-web documents as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

**Claim 12,14**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches for each of the linked documents, comparing the query with the contents of the linked document, and determining a score for the linked document based on a degree of match between the query and the contents of the linked document (ie., search query ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned a weight and the weights are combined to provide a score for the item)(col 1, lines 50-63; col 2, lines 25-43; col 3, lines 30-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a search query ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned a weight and

Art Unit: 2176

the weights are combined to provide a score for the item as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

**Claim 15**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches "reordering the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores)(col 2, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

**Claim 16**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches "sorting the entries based on the determined scores" (ie., sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores) (col 2, lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a sorting module to sort search result according to the relevant scores as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

**Claim 20**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches "moving one or more of the entries with a score above a threshold to a prominent locations in the

Art Unit: 2176

identified document” (ie., user selects relevance factors and the presentation of results differs)(col 13, lines 1-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a search query ranked according to user-specified relevance factors where each of the attributes are assigned a weight and the weights are combined to provide a score for the item as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

**Claim 23**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Pant teaches “adding at least one of scores, rating symbols, and document information to the entries based on the determined scores” (ie., percentage as score)(col 2, lines 35-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include a percentage as score as taught by Pant, providing the benefit of a searching large collections of information (ie., records, text documents, etc.,) which include relevant items of what the framer of the search has in mind (Pant, col 1, lines 32-35).

**6-3) Claims 7, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Page (US 6285999, filed Jan 9, 1998).**

**Claim 7**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches “for each of the linked documents, determining scores for one or more linking documents that

contain links to the linked documents,” “determining scores for each of the linked documents based on the scores of the one or more linking documents,” “associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified documents” (col 3, lines 20-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include provide for scoring linked database documents as taught by Page, providing the motivation to determine the importance of a document (Page, col 3, lines 20-25).

**Claim 9**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches “determining a popularity of each of the linked documents,” “determining scores for each of the linked documents based on the determined popularity,” “associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified documents” (ie., importance of a document if highly cited by other documents... rank assigned to it ... providing a score linked database documents) (col 2, lines 55-65; col 3, lines 5-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

**Claim 10**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Page teaches “for each of the linked documents, determining a popularity of a web site containing the linked document,” “associating the popularity of the web site to the linked document” (ie.,

importance of a document if highly cited by other documents... rank assigned to it ... providing a score linked database documents) (col 2, lines 55-65; col 3, lines 1-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col 2, lines 20-35).

**6-4) Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Lazarus et al. (US Patent 6134532, filed Nov 1997).**

**Claim 8**, Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Lazarus teaches “determining a clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents” (Lazarus, col 26, line 38).

Kirsch in view of Webwatcher does not teach, but Lazarus teaches “determining scores for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rate” (Lazarus, col 26, lines 15-55).

Kirsch in view of Webwatcher teaches “associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the identified document” (col 2, lines 35-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of Webwatcher to include determining a clickthrough rate as taught in Lazarus, providing the benefit of selecting and presenting personally



targeted entities such as advertising ,... based on observed user behavior (Lazarus, Abstract) for practical and financial reasons (col 1, lines 40-50).

**6-5) Claim 19, 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above), in view of WebWatcher (as cited above), further in view of Brown et al. (US Patent 6635838, filed Jul 30, 1999).**

**In regard to dependent claim 19,** Kirsch in view of WebWatcher does not teach, but Brown teaches "changing at least one of a font, style, size, or color of the entries provided to the user" (ie., bolding, color, text size, font, italic, shading on text)(Brown, col 7, line 55 – col 8, line 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of WebWatcher to include alteration of text to highlight the query text/data as taught in Brown, providing the benefit for internet users to have a tool to enable them to make more informed decisions about which links to follow and improving the performance of the web browsing (Brown, col 2, lines 15-20).

**In regard to dependent claim 21,** Kirsch in view of WebWatcher does not teach, but Brown teaches "deleting one or more of the entries with scores below a predetermined threshold" (ie., if below threshold, not displaying one of the prefetched entries)(col 10, lines 25-60; fig 12, items 1205-1260).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch in view of WebWatcher to include removing an entry from a final display or a prefetched list if the threshold is not met, as taught in Brown, providing the benefit of an internet tool to enable users to make more informed decision about

which link to follow, and dramatically improving the performance of the web browsing (Brown, col 2, lines 15-18).

**6-6) Claims 32, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch et al (as cited above).**

**Claim 32, 34**, Kirsch teaches a memory configured to store instruction (ie., memory on a computer)(col 7, line 4);

Kirsch does not teach a processor configured to execute ... the one second server, but does teach a document server attached to the multiple databases servers distributed within search site, and a skilled artisan would consider these distributed servers as equivalent to the second server as claimed (ie., to determined score for the entries from a predetermined document from a collection of documents)(col 4, lines 1-5; col 7, line 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kirsch to include the distributed database servers working in conjunction with a document server to determine the score for providing search query results as suggested by Kirsch, providing the benefit of real-time document indexes that can be distributed over a number of collection index servers to service search queries from a client (col 3, lines 52-57).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Examiner introduces the Kirsch Patent reference and the Webwatcher NonPatent Literature to teach the amended claim

Art Unit: 2176

limitations in light of the arguments presented. The thrust of the Applicant's arguments address the claims as amended. Please refer to the new line of rejections to address these remarks.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C.S-

\*\*\*

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*9/29/2005*